



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.         | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 10/809,315   | 03/24/2004  | David M. Durham      | 42P19299                    | 6493             |
| 45209  | 7590        | 09/29/2009           |                             |                  |
| INTEL/BSTZ<br>BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP<br>1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY<br>SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>SCHMIDT, KARI L |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT                    | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 2439                        |                  |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE                   | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |             |                      | 09/29/2009                  | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/809,315

**Applicant(s)**

DURHAM ET AL.

**Examiner**

KARI L. SCHMIDT

**Art Unit**

2439

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Edan Orgad/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that Davis, Ravi, Remer, and Cromer fail to teach or suggest "...the embedded agent of the one of the client verifying that a platform of the one of the clients is not in a compromised state... and in response to... the verifying...". The examiner disagrees.

The examiner notes that Davis teaches the use of a security processing system (see at least, [0036]) that can be implemented as a card (e.g. NIC) that connects into a slot of a host system (e.g. client device). The host processor (e.g. client device) can communicate with the security processing system via a API interface stored in an hard drive (see at least, [0036]). The examiner notes that this is interpreted to be an embedded agent of the client. The examiner further notes the security processing system may serve as a trusted hardware device that can be authenticated by using a authentication input device (see at least, [0042]) which could be a smart card (see at least, [0038]). The examiner has further interpreted that by authenticating the security processing system via an input authentication device and further the security processing system may communication verification or other information of the authentication input device to a host processor (e.g. client device) (see [0042]: a form of mutual hardware authentication). The examiner notes by the security processing system being integrated in a host system it acts as an embedded agent that can verify that the client is not comprised via the use of a authentication input device (e.g. see at least, [0038]: the examiner notes a input device acts as a mechanism for enabling the functions of the security processor or information loading mechanism for loading keys). If the security processing system cannot authentication the input device it can be viewed as "a compromised state" of the host device (e.g. security processing system and authentication input device). Therefore by a successful authentication that would signify that the platform is not compromised. Further the examiner notes Cromer discloses indicating being compromised and foreclosing network access if being compromised (see at least, [0048] and [0056]: the examiner notes querying the integrity is a form of requesting (e.g. indicating) of being compromised and culminating without further processing is interpreted to be foreclosing). Therefore the examiner notes given the interpretation taken by the examiner the examiner notes the combination of Davis in view of Ravi, Remer, and Cromer teach the claimed limitations of the invention, therefore this argument is not persuasive.